

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/723,439	11/26/2003	Harry S. Winchell	013996-001000US	6219	
	20350 7590 04/04/2007 TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP			EXAMINER	
TWO EMBARC	CADERO CENTER	HENLEY III, RAYMOND J			
EIGHTH FLOOR SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1614		
SHORTENED STATUTORY	PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
3 MONTHS		04/04/2007	PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

•	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/723,439	WINCHELL, HARRY S.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Raymond J. Henley III	1614				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	TE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 6(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status	•					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	_•					
	action is non-final.	÷				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar						
closed in accordance with the practice under E	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-50</u> is/are pending in the application.		·				
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-50</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.	•					
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.					
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		·				
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign.	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)	)-(d) or (f).				
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:	•					
1. Certified copies of the priority documents	•					
<ol><li>Certified copies of the priority documents</li></ol>						
<ol><li>Copies of the certified copies of the prior</li></ol>		ed in this National Stage				
application from the International Bureau						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)						
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)						
Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  Raper No(s)/Mail Date 4/25/5+3/22/04  5) Notice of Informal Patent Application 6) Other:						
raper Note / Iviair Date 1/2 sp 3 - 7 - 7	<u> </u>					

Art Unit: 1614

## **CLAIMS 1-50 ARE PRESENTED FOR EXAMINATION**

The Information Disclosure Statements filed March 22, 2004 and April 25, 2004 have been received and entered into the application. As reflected by the attached, completed copies of form PTO/SB/08A, (2 sheets), the cited references have been considered by the Examiner.

## Legal Standard for Anticipation/Inherency Under - 35 USC § 102

To anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102, a single prior art reference must place the invention in the public's possession by disclosing each and every element of the claimed invention in a manner sufficient to enable one skilled in the art to practice the invention. Scripps Clinic & Research Foundation v. Genetech, Inc., 927 F.2d 1565, 1576, 18 U.S.P.Q.2d 1001, 1001 (Fed. Cir. 1991); In re Donahue, 766 F2d531, 533, 226 U.S.P.Q. 619, 621 (Fed. Cir. 1985). To anticipate, the prior art must either expressly or inherently disclose every limitation of the claimed invention. MEHL/Biophile Int'l Corp. v. Milgraum, 192 F.3d 1362, 1365, 52 U.S.P.Q.2d 1303, 1303 (Fed. Cir. 1999) (citing to In re Schreiber, 128 F.3d 1473, 1477, 44 U.S.P.Q. 1429, 1431 (Fed. Cir. 1997)); Atlas Powder Co. v. Ireco Inc., 190 F.3d 1342, 1347, 51 U.S.P.Q.2d 1943, 1946 (Fed. Cir. 1999). To inherently anticipate, the prior art must necessarily function in accordance with, or include, the claimed limitations. MEHL/Biophile, 192 F.3d at 1365, 52 U.S.P.Q.2d at 1303. However, it is not required that those of ordinary skill in the art recognize the inherent characteristics or the function of the prior art. Id. Specifically, discovery of the mechanism underlying a known process does not make it patentable. See also MPEP §§ 2112, 2112.02 and 2145(II).

Art Unit: 1614

#### Claim Rejection - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-29, 33-35, 37, 38, 41, 42, 46 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Winchell et al., (U.S. Patent No. 5,874,573, cited by Applicant) who teach pharmaceutical compositions, (col. 10, lines 45-62), comprising the presently claimed cyclic polyaza chelator compounds, (col. 6, compound (II); col. 6, line 46 – col. 7, line 47), magnesium or calcium, (col. 10, line 61, "calcium chloride" and col. 68, lines 6-16), and pharmaceutically acceptable carriers, (col. 10, line 48).

The patentees further teach that the compositions are to be administered for the purpose of treating a variety of disorders/diseases including reperfusion injury, (col. 2, lines 44-45).

While the reference is silent as to the ability of the compositions, once administered, to provide (i) an enhancement of biological activity of the cyclic polyaza compound, (e.g., present claim 27) or (ii) neuroprotection or cardioprotection, (e.g., present claim 29), such would be inherent in the method of administering taught in the reference because the compounds are administered in the same manner and would be present in the same physiological environment.

# Claim Rejection - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person

Art Unit: 1614

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Winchell et al., (U.S. Patent No. 5,874,573), for the reasons set forth above, which reasons are here incorporated by reference, in view of Weglicki, (U.S. Patent No. 5,854,287, cited by Applicant).

In addition to the above, Winchell et al. further teach the presently claimed polyaza compounds as being useful in the management of free radical tissue damage and oxidation mediated tissue damage, (e.g., see the abstract near the end).

The differences between the above and the presently claimed subject matter lies in that the patentees fail to highlight that the polyaza compounds may be used to provide a cardioprotective and/or neuroprotective effect or for mitigating damage to the central nervous system or to the heart.

However, to the skilled artisan, the claimed subject matter would have been obvious for the reasons that follow.

Weglicki teaches that the compound d-propranolol is an antioxidant because it can neutralize excessive free radicals and because free radicals are known to promote a number of cardiovascular and neurological diseases, the antioxidant may provide beneficial effects in treating diseases such as ischemia, reperfusion and/or neurodegeneration, (col. 2, lines 15-38).

The skilled artisan would have been motivated to employ the compounds of Winchell et al. in the above manner taught by Weglicki because of the common mechanism of action shared by both patentees' compounds, i.e., actions against free radical activity. The results of such would have been the use of the presently claimed polyaza compounds for the treatment of various cardiovascular and/or neurological disorders which reasonably could be interpreted as to

Art Unit: 1614

providing a cardioprotective and/or neuroprotective effect or for mitigating damage to the central nervous system or to the heart.

## **Double Patenting**

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-26 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-21 of U.S. Patent No. 5,874,573, (Winchell et al.). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the patented claims provide for physiological salts of the claimed compounds, (e.g., see col. 73, line 65) and the selection of any particular cation from those known, such as magnesium or calcium, would have been a matter well within the purview of the skilled artisan. The artisan would have been motivated to select any particular cation, such as calcium or magnesium, because the patented claims are silent with respect to a specific cation and thus a selection of a

Art Unit: 1614

cation from those known would have been necessary in order to practice that aspect of the invention of the patented claims.

None of the claims are currently in condition for allowance.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Raymond J. Henley III whose telephone number is 571-272-0575. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8:30 am to 4:00 pm Eastern Time.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ardin H. Marschel can be reached on 571-272-0718. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000:

Primary Examiner

Art Unit 1614